

Remarks

Claims 47, 51-58, 63, and 65-74 are pending in the application with claims 47, 63, and 66 amended, new claims 67-74 added, and claims 59-62 cancelled herein.

Applicant expresses appreciation for the telephone interview on January 15, 2009 between Applicant's attorney, James Lake, and Examiner RoDee. The parties discussed support in the specification for the claim amendments. No agreement was reached. The support discussed is reiterated below.

Claims 66 stands objected to for failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 63. Applicant requests reconsideration. Allegedly, using the ionomer coating to reverse polarity imparted on toner particles by the charge director, as in claim 66, is inconsistent with increasing the chargeability of the toner particles, as in claim 63. However, reference both to Table 4 and Table 5 in the present specification reveals that the two limitations can be consistent. Page 14, lines 9-15 expressly states that Table 5 shows both an increase in chargeability and reversal of polarity. In Table 5, polarity is positive with no ionomer, but reverses with 10% and 20% ionomer. In Table 4, polarity is positive for BBP charge director with no ionomer, but reverses with 5% ionomer. At least for such reasons, Applicant asserts that claim 66 further limits the subject matter of claim 63 and requests withdrawal of the objection in the next Office Action.

Claims 47, 51-58, 63, 65, and 66 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Allegedly, for the term "about 103 pmho/cm," Table 5 does not support an increase in chargeability above 103 pmho/cm. Applicant herein amends the claims to remove the subject term, but notes that at least Table 3 supports an increase in chargeability above 103 pmho/cm, as further explained below. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection in the next Office Action.

Claims 47 and 51-58 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 47 is amended herein to remove a reference to a same chargeability for colors. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection in the next Office Action.

Claims 47 and 63 are amended herein to set forth the coating of the at least one ionomer increasing the chargeability of the toner particles to greater than 7 pmho/cm. In the present specification, with no ionomer, Run 1 of Table 3 shows a

particle conductivity of 3, BBP and CAP charge directors of Table 4 yield particle conductivities of 1 and 2, respectively, and Run 1 of Table 5 shows a particle conductivity of 7 pmho/cm. Tables 3-5 all show the use of ionomers increasing the chargeability of toner particles. Table 5 shows 10% ionomer increasing particle conductivity by 79 pmho/cm and increasing the amount of ionomer to 20% increasing particle conductivity by 96 pmho/com. Table 3 also shows that increasing ionomer content produces increasing levels of particle conductivity. Consequently, the specification supports increasing the chargeability of toner particles to greater than 7 pmho/cm.

New claims 67 and 70 set forth the coating of the at least one ionomer increasing the chargeability of the toner particles by at least 15 pmho/com. Table 4 shows 5% ionomer increasing particle conductivity above the particle conductivity with no ionomer by 15 pmho/cm for CAP charge director. Tables 3-5 show still higher increases. Consequently, the specification supports increasing the chargeability of toner particles by at least 15 pmho/cm.

New claims 68 and 71 set forth the coating of the at least one ionomer increasing the chargeability of the toner particles by 15 to 161 pmho/cm. Table 3 shows 20% ionomer increasing particle conductivity by 161 pmho/cm. Consequently, the specification supports increasing the chargeability of toner particles by 15 to 161 pmho/cm.

New claim 72 sets forth the coating of the at least one ionomer increasing the chargeability of the toner particles by 23 to 161 pmho/cm. Table 4 shows 5% ionomer increasing particle conductivity by 23 pmho/cm for BBP charge director. Consequently, the specification supports increasing the chargeability of toner particles by 23 to 161 pmho/cm.

New claim 73 sets forth the coating of the at least one ionomer increasing the chargeability of the toner particles by 23 to 96 pmho/cm. New claim 74 sets forth the coating of the at least one ionomer increasing the chargeability of the toner particles by 79 to 161 pmho/cm. As may be appreciated from the discussion above regarding the teachings in Table 5, the specification supports claims 73 and 74.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is

available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,  
Yaakov Almog

By: /James E. Lake/  
James E. Lake  
Reg. No. 44,854  
Date: January 19, 2008